Although it was not possible for the committee to evaluate the lance and monitoring efforts of the state and local programs examimocl, committee found that strong surveillance and monitoring efforts are or it to ensuring compliance with program requirements. Most of the local programs examined have field surveillance and monitorin and analytical laboratory support. However, all indicated that such cs bility falls short of that required to adequately monitor the resource compliance of the regulated community with program requirements - Surveillance and monitoring programs must be coupled with strong 1< enforcement activities to ensure compliance with program requireme Such efforts include criminal and civil penalties for violations adrniniste through administrative or judicial procedures, authority to prohibit charges or construction of polluting activities, and administrative aO- t:ho to order actions to prevent, cease, or remediate environmental cont^tmi tion. All the state and local programs examined by the committee have forcement programs with varying scope. While it was not possible for committee to evaluate the effectiveness of all state and local enforoerr programs examined, several present good examples of the kind of enf o ment programs that are needed to protect ground water.

In Kansas, enforcement authority is supplied by the state's health, e; ronmental, and conservation laws. Geohydrologists and engineers of Kansas Department of Health and Environment (DHE) are stationed ii district offices in addition to the central office staff and are responsible finding violations and working up cases. Actions are usually brought: by state legal staff of DHE or the Corporation Commission. Maximum, d fines for water contamination per violation are $10,000 to $25,OOO per currence per day. Both departments can levy fines directly, and ajppes District Court. Violations such as dumping of wastes carry a $5,OOO plus jail. Fines of $2,500 to $5,000 are automatic on violations such a.s \ ure to obtain a permit before starting to drill for a disposal or oil well. ' most-used enforcement tool in Kansas is the shutting down of an oil leas industrial activity. Fines go into a fund that can be used for clean.up. ' largest fine for one operator during 1984 was $195,000.

New Jersey and Connecticut, with substantial authority to iregu ground water discharges, have used ground and surface water permit quirements to close down hundreds of municipal solid waste landfills 1 were contaminating surface and ground water. By the end of 1986., 1s Jersey expects to have eliminated all landfills owned and operated by or f single municipality. All solid waste will eventually be managed tih.ro regional recycling or resource recovery facilities or disposed of in regie landfills meeting state environmental requirements. These strong enf o ment efforts required strong support from the attorney general's office, state legislature, and the public in both states.